



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/858,387	05/15/2001	Donald C.D. Chang	PD-201006A	3432
20991	7590	04/21/2004	EXAMINER	
THE DIRECTV GROUP INC			TORRES, MARCOS L	
PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION RE/R11/A109			ART UNIT	
P O BOX 956			PAPER NUMBER	
EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245-0956			2683	3
DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/858,387	CHANG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Marcos L Torres	2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. Claims 8, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claim 8 recites the limitation "reconfigurable antenna" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
4. Claim 11 recites the limitation "said bus" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1, 5-6, 8 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross in view of Ward.

As to claims 1 and 5-6, Gross discloses a base station generating a plurality of communication beams (see fig. 2, items 202, 208, 213; col. 4, lines 3-9); and an access (gateway) station connected to said BTS, by a plurality of beams commands that communicate a plurality of control signal to the BTS to form the communication beams (see col. 5, lines 26-56; col. 4, lines 49-54; col. 8, lines 20-25). Gross do not specifically disclose the BTS with a plurality of main array antenna elements. Ward disclosed the BTS with a plurality of main array antenna elements (see col. 10, line 66 – col. 11, line 27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Gross and Ward teachings for the simple reason of enhanced bandwidth.

As to claim 8, Gross discloses a communication system with phased array antennas (see col. 4, lines 49-52).

As to claim 11, Gross discloses a communication system with a controller to control the antennas (see col. 4, lines 49-54).

As to claim 12, Gross discloses a communication system with users receiving communication beam (see fig. 2, item 212,213).

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross in view of Ward and further in view of Agee.

As to claims 20, Gross discloses a base station generating a plurality of communication beams (see fig. 2, items 202, 208, 213; col. 4, lines 3-9); and an access (gateway) station connected to said BTS, by a plurality of dynamic link, forming beams commands that communicate a plurality of control signal to the BTS to form the communication beams (see col. 5, lines 26-56; col. 4, lines 49-54; col. 8, lines 20-25).

Gross do not specifically disclose the BTS with a plurality of main array antenna elements or the use of packets. Ward disclosed the BTS with a plurality of main array antenna elements (see col. 10, line 66 – col. 11, line 27). Agee disclose the use of multi-element antenna array receiving packets (see col. 12, lines 43-58) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Gross and Ward teachings for the simple reason of enhanced bandwidth.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross in view of Ward as applied to claims 1, 5-6, 8 and 11-12 above, and further in view of Denney.

As to claim 2, Ward disclosed the BTS with a plurality of main array antenna elements (see col. 10, line 66 – col. 11, line 27). Gross and Ward do not specifically

disclose a communication system wherein the adaptive antenna comprises a plurality of panels. Denney discloses a communication system wherein the adaptive antenna comprises a plurality of panels (see col. 6, lines 39-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add this teaching to the modified Gross and Ward system for enhanced efficiency and lower production cost.

7. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross in view of Ward as applied to claims 1, 5-6, 8 and 11-12 above, and further in view of Gutleber.

As to claim 3, Ward disclosed the BTS with a plurality of array antenna elements (see col. 10, line 66 – col. 11, line 27). Gross and Ward do not specifically disclose a communication system wherein the base station comprises a plurality of auxiliary elements for canceling interference. Gutleber disclose a communication system wherein the base station comprises a plurality of auxiliary elements for canceling interference (see col. 4, lines 19-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add this teaching to the modified Gross and Ward system for the simple purpose of enhanced quality of communication by rejecting interference.

As to claim 4, OFFICIAL NOTICE IS TAKEN THAT the method of weighting signals to provide interference canceling is a common and well-known method. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to add this teaching to the modified Gross and Ward system for the simple purpose of enhanced quality of communication by rejecting interference.

8. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross in view of Ward as applied to claims 1, 5-6, 8 and 11-12 above, and further in view of Murray.

As to claims 9, Gross and Ward do not specifically disclose a communication system wherein the main array is modular. Murray discloses a communication system wherein the main array is modular (see col. 1, lines 4-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add this teaching to the modified Gross and Ward system for enhanced efficiency and lower production cost.

As to claims 10, Murray discloses a communication system wherein the main array is modular (see col. 1, lines 4-7). Murray does not specifically disclose the modules couple to a bus. However OFFICIAL NOTICE IS TAKEN THAT the method of using a communication bus is a common and well-known method. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add this teaching to the modified Gross and Ward system for enhanced efficiency and lower production cost.

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross in view of Ward as applied to claims 1, 5-6, 8 and 11-12 above, and further in view of Kasperkovitz.

As to claim 13, Gross and Ward do not specifically disclose a communication system further comprising a limiter coupled to a feedback path. Kasperkovitz discloses a communication system further comprising a limiter coupled to a feedback path (see col. 7, lines 6-9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add this teaching to the modified Gross and Ward system for the simple purpose of controlling a device.

10. Claims 14-17, 19 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross in view of Ward as applied to claims 1, 5-6, 8 and 11-12 above, and further in view of Agee.

As to claim 14-17 and 19, Gross and Ward do not specifically disclose a communication system further comprising a nulling processor further comprising a code despread and weighted feedback. Agee discloses a communication system further comprising a nulling processor further comprising a code despread and weighted feedback (see col. 23, lines 7-29; col. 11, lines 33-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add this teaching to the modified Gross and Ward system for the simple purpose of enhanced quality of communication by rejecting interference.

Regarding claims 21-22, they are the corresponding method claims of system claims 20 and 3. Therefore, claims 21-22 are rejected for the same reason shown above.

11. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross in view of Ward as applied to claims 1, 5-6, 8 and 11-12 above, and further in view of Park, and further in view of Janc and further in view of Sayegh.

As to claim 18, Gross discloses a communication system with a gateway station comprising an analog to digital converter (see col. 4, lines 47-54; col. 5, lines 32-37). Ward disclosed a communication system further comprising the BTS with a plurality of main array antenna elements (see col. 10, line 66 – col. 11, line 27). Ward does not specifically disclose a plurality of summing blocks coupled to the main array, or a gateway station comprising A/D converter coupled to a noise injection circuit and the summed signal and said summed signal coupled to a demultiplexer and a beam forming circuit. Park discloses a plurality of summing blocks coupled to the main array (see col. 2, lines 22-37). Janc discloses a communication system comprising A/D converter coupled to a noise injection circuit and the summed signal (see col. 4, lines 18-28). Sayegh discloses a demultiplexer and a beam forming circuit (see abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use this technique in order to process the signal.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Wiedeman U.S. Patent US005884142A
- b. Dietrich U.S. Patent US005552798A
- c. Wismec U.S. Patent US006118998A

- d. Joshi U.S. Patent US006278876B1
- e. Miller U.S. Patent US006510172B1
- f. Matthews U.S. Publication US 20020049055A1
- g. Laborde U.S. Patent 5689568
- h. Rosen U.S. Patent 4872015

Any response to this Office Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 703-872-9314

For formal communication intended for entry, informal communication or draft communication; in the case of informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Park II
2121 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA
Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marcos L Torres whose telephone number is 703-305-1478. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:30pm alt. friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William G Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Marcos L Torres
Examiner
Art Unit 2683

Mlt



WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600